

SOLICITOR

AO 120 (Rev. 2/99)

TO: Mail Stop 8 Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	JUN 21 2007	REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK
---	--------------------	---

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been
 filed in the U.S. District Court Northern District of California on the following ☒ Patents or ☐ Trademarks:

DOCKET NO. CV 07-03151 WDB	DATE FILED June 14, 2007	U.S. DISTRICT COURT Northern District of California, 1301 Clay St., RM 400S, Oakland, CA 94612
PLAINTIFF RONALD A. KATZ TECHNOLOGY		DEFENDANT ECHOSTAR COMMUNICATIONS CORP, ET.AL

PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1 19 Pats 195-7		See Attached Complaint
2		
3		
4		
5		

In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included:

DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Answer <input type="checkbox"/> Cross Bill <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pleading			
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK		
1		See Attached Complaint		
2				
3				
4				
5				

In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued:

DECISION/JUDGEMENT

CLERK Richard W. Wicking	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK	DATE
---------------------------------	-------------------	------

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Commissioner
 Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 4—Case file copy

1 E. A judgment holding this Action an exceptional case, and an award to Plaintiff Katz
2 Technology Licensing for its attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285; and

3 F. Such other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

4 Dated: June 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

5
6 By: 

Stephen C. Neal (State Bar No. 170085)

nealsc@cooley.com

Janet L. Cullum (State Bar No. 104336)

jcullum@cooley.com

Linda F. Callison (State Bar No. 167785)

lcallison@cooley.com

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP

Five Palo Alto Square

3000 El Camino Real

Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155

Telephone: (650) 843-5000

Facsimile: (650) 857-0663

7
8
9
10
11
12
13 Of Counsel:

Frank V. Pietrantonio

fpietrantonio@cooley.com

Jonathan G. Graves

jgraves@cooley.com

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP

One Freedom Square

11951 Freedom Drive

Reston, VA 20190-5656

Telephone: (703) 456-8000

Facsimile: (703) 456-8100

14
15
16
17
18
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff

Ronald A. Katz Technology Licensing, L.P.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

Dated: June 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Facsimile: (650) 857-0663

Of Counsel:

Facsimile: (703) 456-8100

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Ronald A. Katz Technology Licensing, L.P.

1 Stephen C. Neal (State Bar No. 170085)
nealsc@cooley.com
2 Janet L. Cullum (State Bar No. 104336)
jcullum@cooley.com
3 Linda F. Callison (State Bar No. 167785)
lcallison@cooley.com
4 COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP
Five Palo Alto Square
5 3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
6 Telephone: (650) 843-5000
Facsimile: (650) 857-0663
7 Attorneys for Plaintiff
Ronald A. Katz Technology Licensing, L.P.

ORIGINAL
FILED
07 JUN 14 PM 3:11
RICHARD W. WIEKING
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIF.

8
9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

11 RONALD A. KATZ TECHNOLOGY
12 LICENSING, L.P.,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 ECHOSTAR COMMUNICATIONS CORP.
16 and
ECHOSTAR SATELLITE L.L.C.

17 Defendants.
18

C07 03151

CASE NO.

WDB

Jury Trial Demanded

19 **PLAINTIFF RONALD A. KATZ TECHNOLOGY LICENSING, L.P.'S**
20 **COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

21 Plaintiff, Ronald A. Katz Technology Licensing, L.P. ("Katz Technology Licensing"), by
22 counsel, alleges as follows:

23 **THE PARTIES**

24 1. Plaintiff Katz Technology Licensing is a limited partnership organized under the
25 laws of the State of California. and having a principal place of business at 9220 Sunset Blvd.
26 #315, Los Angeles, CA 90069.
27
28

2. On information and belief, Defendant EchoStar Communications Corp. ("ECC") is a Nevada entity maintaining its principal place of business at 9601 South Meridian Boulevard, Englewood, CO 80112.

3. On information and belief, Defendant EchoStar Satellite L.L.C. ("ESLLC") is a Colorado entity maintaining its principal place of business at 9601 South Meridian Boulevard, Englewood, CO 80112.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This is a civil action for patent infringement arising under the United States patent statutes, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*

5. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

6. Upon information and belief, Defendants ECC and ESLLC (collectively, the "EchoStar defendants") are subject to this Court's personal jurisdiction because pursuant to a January 2005 agreement ECC and ESLLC consented to the personal jurisdiction of this Court for suits arising from the Katz Technology Licensing patent portfolio. In addition, the EchoStar defendants do and have done substantial business in this judicial district, including: (i) offering satellite television programming to customers, including customers within this State and in this District; (ii) operating infringing automated telephone call processing systems, including without limitation the DISH Network customer service telephone system, that allow its customers, including customers within this State and in this District, to perform pay-per-view ordering and customer service functions over the telephone; and/or (iii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and/or deriving substantial revenue from services provided to individuals in this State and in this District. In addition, Defendant ESLLC has designated an agent for service of process in the State of California.

7. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)-(c) and 1400(b).

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15

16
17
18
19
20

21
22
23

24
25
26
27

1 14. Early clients of Call Interactive included *The New York Times*, ABC's *Monday*
2 *Night Football*, KABC Radio, CBS News, and Beatrice Foods (Hunt-Wesson division).

3 15. Many of these clients utilized Call Interactive technology for high-profile events.
4 For example, CBS News hired Call Interactive to operate an interactive, real-time telephone poll
5 to gauge viewer reaction to President George H.W. Bush's 1992 State of the Union address.

6 16. Mr. Katz sold his interest in Call Interactive to American Express in 1989 but
7 continued to provide advisory services to Call Interactive until 1992. American Express later
8 spun off the First Data business unit into a separate corporation, and with that new entity went
9 Mr. Katz's interactive call processing patents and the Call Interactive call processing business.
10 The former Call Interactive, now known as First Data Voice Services, continues to provide call
11 processing solutions today.

12 17. In 1994, Mr. Katz formed Katz Technology Licensing, which acquired the rights
13 to the entire interactive call processing patent portfolio, including the rights to each of the patents-
14 in-suit, from First Data, the owner of all of the Katz interactive call processing patents at that
15 time.

16 18. The marketplace has clearly recognized the value of Mr. Katz's inventions.
17 Indeed, over 150 companies have licensed the patents-in-suit. Licensees include IBM, Hewlett-
18 Packard, Bank of America, JPMorgan Chase, Wells Fargo, HSBC, Verizon, Sprint, Microsoft,
19 Delta Airlines, Merck, Sears, and Home Shopping Network. These licenses and others
20 acknowledge the applicability of the patents-in-suit to multiple fields of use, including but not
21 limited to financial services call processing, automated securities transactions, automated credit
22 card authorization services, automated wireless telecommunication services and support,
23 automated health care services, and product and service support.

24 19. Each of the defendants employs the inventions of certain of the patents-in-suit.
25 Katz Technology Licensing, through its licensing arm A2D, L.P., has repeatedly attempted to
26 engage each defendant in licensing negotiations, but to date, none of the defendants have agreed
27 to take a license to any of the patents-in-suit.

THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT

20. On December 20, 1988, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 4,792,968 ("the '968 Patent"), entitled "Statistical Analysis System For Use With Public Communication Facility," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The '968 Patent expired on December 20, 2005.

21. On May 29, 1990, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 4,930,150 ("the '150 Patent"), entitled "Telephonic Interface Control System," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The '150 Patent expired on December 20, 2005.

22. On April 28, 1992, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 5,109,404 ("the '404 Patent"), entitled "Telephone Call Processor with Select Call Routing," to Ronald A. Katz and Thomas D. Thompson, co-inventors. The '404 Patent expired on December 20, 2005.

23. On July 7, 1992, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 5,128,984 ("the '984 Patent"), entitled "Telephone Interface Call Processing System With Call Selectivity," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor.

24. On September 27, 1994, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 5,351,285 ("the '285 Patent"), entitled "Multiple Format Telephonic Interface Control System," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The '285 Patent expired on December 20, 2005.

25. On October 1, 1996, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 5,561,707 ("the '707 Patent"), entitled "Telephonic-Interface Statistical Analysis System," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The '707 Patent expired on December 20, 2005.

26. On November 4, 1997, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 5,684,863 ("the '863 Patent"), entitled "Telephonic-Interface Statistical Analysis System," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The '863 Patent expired on December 20, 2005.

1 27. On September 29, 1998, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and
2 legally issued United States Patent No. 5,815,551 ("the '551 Patent"), entitled "Telephonic-
3 Interface Statistical Analysis System," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The '551 Patent expired
4 on December 20, 2005.

5 28. On October 27, 1998, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and
6 legally issued United States Patent No. 5,828,734 ("the '734 Patent"), entitled "Telephone
7 Interface Call Processing System With Call Selectivity," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor.

8 29. On April 27, 1999, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally
9 issued United States Patent No. 5,898,762 ("the '762 Patent"), entitled "Telephonic-Interface
10 Statistical Analysis System," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The '762 Patent expired on
11 December 20, 2005.

12 30. On June 29, 1999, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally
13 issued United States Patent No. 5,917,893 ("the '893 Patent"), entitled "Multiple Format
14 Telephonic Interface Control System," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The '893 Patent expired
15 on December 20, 2005.

16 31. On October 26, 1999, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and
17 legally issued United States Patent No. 5,974,120 ("the '120 Patent"), entitled "Telephone
18 Interface Call Processing System With Call Selectivity," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor.

19 32. On November 14, 2000, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and
20 legally issued United States Patent No. 6,148,065 ("the '065 Patent"), entitled "Telephonic-
21 Interface Statistical Analysis System," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The '065 Patent expired
22 on July 10, 2005.

23 33. On January 1, 2002, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and
24 legally issued United States Patent No. 6,335,965 ("the '965 Patent"), entitled "Voice-Data
25 Telephonic Interface Control System," to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The '965 Patent expired
26 on December 20, 2005.

27 34. On February 19, 2002, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and
28 legally issued United States Patent No. 6,349,134 ("the '134 Patent"), entitled "Telephonic-

Interface Statistical Analysis System,” to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The ‘134 Patent expired on December 20, 2005.

35. On July 23, 2002, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 6,424,703 (“the ‘703 Patent”), entitled “Telephone-Interface Lottery System,” to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The ‘703 Patent expired on July 10, 2005.

36. On August 13, 2002, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 6,434,223 (“the ‘223 Patent”), entitled “Telephone Interface Call Processing System With Call Selectivity,” to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The ‘223 Patent expired on July 10, 2005.

37. On January 28, 2003, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 6,512,415 (“the ‘415 Patent”), entitled “Telephonic-Interface Game Control System,” to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The ‘415 Patent expired on July 10, 2005.

38. On January 13, 2004, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 6,678,360 (“the ‘360 Patent”), entitled “Telephonic-Interface Statistical Analysis System,” to Ronald A. Katz, sole inventor. The ‘360 Patent expired on July 10, 2005.

COUNT I

(PATENT INFRINGEMENT)

39. Katz Technology Licensing realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-38 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

40. Katz Technology Licensing is the sole holder of the entire right, title, and interest in the ‘968, ‘150, ‘404, ‘984, ‘285, ‘707, ‘863, ‘551, ‘734, ‘762, ‘893, ‘120, ‘065, ‘965, ‘134, ‘703, ‘223, ‘415 and ‘360 Patents.

41. Upon information and belief, the EchoStar defendants operate automated telephone systems, including without limitation the DISH Network customer service telephone system, that allow their customers to perform pay-per-view ordering and customer service functions over the telephone.

1 42. The EchoStar defendants have directly and contributorily infringed, and induced
2 others to infringe, one or more claims of each of the patents identified in paragraph 40 of this
3 Complaint by making, using, offering to sell, and/or selling within the United States automated
4 telephone systems, including without limitation the DISH Network customer service telephone
5 system, that allow their customers to perform pay-per-view ordering and customer service
6 functions over the telephone.

7 43. The EchoStar defendants continue to infringe, contributorily infringe, and induce
8 others to infringe the '984, '734 and '120 Patents.

9 44. The EchoStar defendants' infringement of the patents identified in paragraph 40 of
10 this Complaint has been willful.

11 45. Katz Technology Licensing has been, and continues to be, damaged and
12 irreparably harmed by the EchoStar defendants' infringement, which will continue unless the
13 EchoStar defendants are enjoined by this Court.

14 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

15 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Katz Technology Licensing respectfully requests the following
16 relief:

17 A. A judgment holding the EchoStar defendants liable for infringement of the patents
18 identified in paragraph 40 of this Complaint;

19 B. A permanent injunction against the EchoStar defendants, their officers, agents,
20 servants, employees, attorneys, parent and subsidiary corporations, assigns and successors in
21 interest, and those persons in active concert or participation with them, enjoining them from
22 continued acts of infringement of the '984, '734 and '120 Patents;

23 C. An accounting for damages resulting from the EchoStar defendants' infringement
24 of the patents identified in paragraph 40 of this Complaint, together with pre-judgment and post-
25 judgment interest;

26 D. A judgment holding that the EchoStar defendants' infringement of the patents
27 identified in paragraph 40 of this Complaint is willful, and a trebling of damages pursuant to 35
28 U.S.C. § 284;